

REMARKS

Claims 1-18, 22, and 23 were pending in the present application. By virtue of this response, claims 2-6 have been cancelled, claims 1 and 10 have been amended and no claims have been added. The amendments to the claims are fully supported by the claims as originally presented, paragraph [0027], and Fig. 2C, for example. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1, 7-18, 22, and 23 are currently under consideration. Amendment and cancellation of certain claims is not to be construed as a dedication to the public of any of the subject matter of the claims as previously presented.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter. In particular, that claims 6-9 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims (including claim 5). As indicated herein, Applicants have amended claim 1 to include the features of claims 2-6. Accordingly, Applicants request allowance of claims 1, 7-9, and 22.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C 112, second paragraph. Claim 6 has been cancelled, thereby rendering the rejection moot.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-3 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Takano (U.S. Patent No. 7,100,173).

Claim 1 has been amended to include the features of claim 6 and intervening claims (including claim 5), which were indicated to include allowable subject matter on page 8 of the Office Action. Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

A. Claims 4, 5, 10-14, 16-18, and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takano (U.S. Patent No. 7,100,173) in view of Wagner (U.S. Patent No. 5,043,962).

Claims 4 and 5 are cancelled, thereby rendering this portion of the rejection moot.

Claim 22 depends from claim 1 and is allowable over Takano for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

With respect to claim 10, the Office Action states that Takano discloses “a first actuator (not numbered) coupled to the first carriage and the vertical stationary support member 211 configured to actuate linear movement of the first carriage along the stationary support member.”

Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of references fails to disclose or suggest the features of claim 10 as amended; in particular, the references fail to disclose or reasonably suggest “a first actuator fixed to the first assembly and coupled to the vertical stationary support member, the first actuator operable to actuate linear movement of the first assembly along the vertical stationary support member,” as recited. In contrast to these features, Takano illustrates and describes that “vertical moving mechanism 210” is attached to a moving mechanism 200 as shown in Figure 6, disposed at the top of rail 211, where vertical moving mechanism 210 effects movement of the identified first assembly (i.e., mechanism 220) along rail 211 via belt 212. (Takano, col. 8, lines 39-48; Figure 6.) Thus, the actuator of Takano is not fixed to the identified first assembly; rather it is disposed at one end of vertical rail 211.

Accordingly, Takano fails to disclose a first actuator fixed to the first assembly and couplet to the vertical stationary support member to actuate linear movement as recited and the rejection should be withdrawn. Additionally, claims 11-18 and 23 should be allowed for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

B. Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Takano (U.S. Patent No. 7,100,173) in view of Wagner (U.S. Patent No. 5,043,962) as applied to claim 10, and further in view of Hanaki (U.S. Patent No. 6,483,204).

Claim 15 depends from claim 10 and is allowable for at least Takano and Wagner for at least the reasons stated above. The addition of Hanaki fails to cure the deficiencies identified above. Accordingly, claim 15 should be allowed.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952** referencing docket no. 249212023500. However, the Commissioner is not authorized to charge the cost of the issue fee to the Deposit Account.

Dated: June 25, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By

Christopher B. Eide

Registration No.: 48,375
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
755 Page Mill Road
Palo Alto, California 94304-1018
(650) 813-5720